

INCOME MAINTENANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE & WISCONSIN WORKS (W-2) CONTRACT AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

101 S. Webster Street, GEF 2, Room 27
Madison, WI 53707

Friday, June 18, 1999
9:00 AM - 2:00 PM

AMENDED MINUTES

IMAC

Attendees: Dick Buschmann, Milwaukee County Department of Human Services; Mary Ann Cook, Dane Co. Dept. of Human Services; Kelly Grant, CWCAC; Liz Green, Rock Co. Human Services; Shirley Ross, La Crosse Dept. of Human Services; Michael Van Dyke, Door Co. Dept. of Social Services; Kim Walia, Clark Co. Dept. of Social Services; Judy Weseman, Kenosha Co. Dept. of Human Services

W-2 C & I Committee

Attendees: Jean Rogers, Chair; Phyllis Bermingham, Marathon Co. Employment and Training; Mary Ann Cook, Dane Co. Dept. of Human Services; Rosa Dominguez (alternate), Opportunities Industrialization Center of Greater Milwaukee (OIC-GM); George Leutermann, MAXIMUS; Diane Hausinger, Fond du Lac Co. Dept. of Social Services; Deb Hughes (alternate), Southwest Consortium; Rita Renner (alternate), YW-Works; Tina Koehn, United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS); Jim Krivsky (alternate), Racine Co. Human Services Dept.; Barbara Metoxen, Oneida Tribe; Jeff McCabe (alternate), Employment Solutions; Shirley Ross, La Crosse Dept. of Human Services; Michael Van Dyke, Door Co. Dept. of Social Services; Judy Weseman, Kenosha Co. Dept. of Human Services

State Staff

Attendees: Ann Agnew, AO; Stephen Dow, BWI; Anthony Esealuka, BEPO; Tim Hineline, BWI; Kevin Huggins, BEPO; Jane Jilk, BWI; Kay Lawrence, BWI; Kim Markham, Secretary's Office; Germaine Mayhew, DES Training Section; Margaret McMahon, BWI; Dick Mellinger, DHFS; Amy Mendel, BEPO; Jude Morse, BMO; Zulema Ocampo, BEPO; Leonor Rosas DeLeon, BWI; Janice Tripp, BEPO; Tom Van Ess, OQA; Jan Van Vleck, Special Assistant; Tony Veeder, DES Training Section; Alice Wilkins, BWI; Susan Wood, DHFS; Rick Zynda, BWI

Absent: Herbert King, Forward Service Corporation

Guests: Jane Batha, Kaiser Group; Marcia Christianson, Forward Service Corporation; Tony Dziedzic, YW-Works; Joanne Faber, Washington Co. Dept. of Social Services; Sharon McCormick, Sheboygan Co. Dept. of Health and Human Services; Kim Mooney, Fond du Lac Co. Dept. of Social Services

Recorder: Shari Busse, W-2 Contract and Implementation Committee Coordinator

(Note: Jan Van Vleck requested an edit regarding Michael Van Dyke's statement under the Y2K Administrator's Memo and a spelling edit under Contingency Fund. These edits are indicated by a strike through of the incorrect language and underling the new language.)

Welcome

Jean Rogers opened the meeting by announcing a change in the agenda to move the Legislative Update to an earlier time frame.

May 1999 Minute Approval

A motion was made by George Leutermann to approve the May 1999 minutes of the W-2 Contract and Implementation Committee. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Michael Van Dyke to approve the May 1999 minutes of the IMAC. Motion carried.

Issue/Discussion: Monthly Training Update, Germaine Mayhew, DES Training Section

Geri Mayhew referred to the background paper distributed at the meeting to provide a training update to both committees.

- BadgerCare training for eligibility workers began on Monday, June 7 in Eau Claire. At close of business on May 24, 972 participants had been registered for the 2-day training. Training for FEPs who do not determine eligibility will begin on June 21 in Waukesha.
- Response to the supervisory offering "Agency Discretion and W-2 Policy" has been very positive. There does seem to be an issue of a 30% "no show" rate. This is excessively high and we suspect it reflects supervisory workloads. The situation will be researched with an eye to more effective marketing strategies. The supervisory series will help supervisors work effectively with staff to meet program and agency goals through functional application and sharing of best practices. "Developing Leadership for Supervisors" is the other course currently being offered. "Utilizing Program Data" is under development and will be offered in late fall. The Training Section encouraged managers to support attendance at these courses by line supervisors.
- Gwen Altheimer has accepted the position of Training Officer 3. Gwen, formerly a staff trainer for Milwaukee County Department of Human Services, will function as Regional Training Manager for the Milwaukee Region and will co-ordinate DES training activities there.
- The proposed Training Administrative Rule, DWD 17, was redrafted based on comments from a Public Hearing held January 21, 1999 and comments from the Legislative Clearinghouse. The final draft has been submitted to the Secretary for signature and will then go to a legislative committee for review.

Michael Van Dyke asked what the previous no show rate was for supervisors. There are no statistics on that due to there being few courses specifically designed for supervisors in the past. Committee members suggested overbooking training sessions to improve attendance; however, training is usually booked to the maximum room capacity. It was also suggested that the training section do some PR activities to market the training so supervisors will understand the value of attending.

Issue/Discussion: Legislative Update, Kim Markham, Secretary's Office

Kim Markham explained that the budget is currently being debated. The Joint Committee on Finance has made some changes to the Governor's proposals. The Assembly and the Senate must both pass an identical budget bill to forward to the Governor. They will likely convene a conference committee to come to agreement on the bill.

1999-01 Biennial Budget proposals related to W-2/TANF

The Joint Committee on Finance made several changes related to W-2. These include:

- Reducing the funding allocated for W-2 contracts to \$396 million.
- Using TANF to fund EITC rather than GPR funds.
- Eliminating the 4% performance bonus for agencies and giving it to county boards. (There may be a motion to return it as a 3% performance bonus.)
- Increasing the contingency fund to \$95 million and requiring a s.13.10 review to access these funds.
- Changing the W-2 participation period from the 26th of one month to the 25th of the next with payments issues on the 1st of the following month. (In response to a question if this was doable in CARES, Tim Hineline replied it would require significant changes.)
- Eliminating the 60-day residency requirement for W-2.
- Decreased funding for the Early Childhood Excellence Initiative to \$7,500,000 annually.
- Reduced funding for the Workforce Attachment fund to \$10 million annually.
- Changed funding for Community Youth Grants to \$7.5 million annually and named six organizations (Boys & Girls Clubs of America, Silver Spring Neighborhood Association, the Safe and Sound Initiative, the Good Samaritan Project, Inc., the Youth Leadership Academy, Inc., and the Milwaukee Passports for Youth Program) that will receive funding without competitive bid.

Kim stated she felt the TANF package put together by the Joint Committee on Finance will pretty much pass as is. Mary Ann Cook asked if they understand the ramifications. Ann Agnew responded that they care about how it affects how we do business but not necessarily the systems issues. Michael Van Dyke questioned whether Kim was under instructions to lobby to get the funding returned to the contracts. Phyllis Birmingham inquired as to what priority the Department is placing on these issues. The Budget Shop has done projections for the Governor's office. This is a priority and the Department is working with the Governor's office.

Legislative bill proposals related to W-2

- AB 5 (Technical college education under W-2) - would allow a CSJ participant to self-initiate a 1 year Technical School program; no action taken.
- AB 128 (Exempting certain income earned by a dependent or developmentally disabled child from consideration in determining financial eligibility for W-2) – a hearing was held in the Spring and the Department testified against the bill on the basis that a child's income was not likely to determine W-2 eligibility; currently in Joint Finance.

- AB 307/SB 123 (Fair hearing process under W-2) – would essentially replace fact-findings with the fair hearing process; a hearing was held in the Senate and the Department testified against it; no action in Assembly.
- SB 37 (Require DWD to request a waiver from minimum requirements for food stamp clients) – would prevent agencies from requiring an individual who resides in a place with unemployment over 10% to participate in FSET.
- LRB 1134/2 (technical college for certain W-2 participants) – would allow CSJ/W2-T participants to self-initiate in Technical College programs equal to 2 years or less if they are employed or in work experience at least 15 hours per week.

Proposals by the Legislative Council Special Committee on State Strategies for Economic Development relating to W-2
The Joint Legislative Council established the Special Committee on State Strategies for Economic Development to study means to strengthen Wisconsin's competitive economic position in the first decade of the next millennium. The Special Committee has developed some proposals that are likely to be introduced as separate bills.

- One proposal (WLCS0064) requires the technical college system board to establish a statewide job retention skills development program to assist employers to retain new employees, build the job skill levels of those employees and assist those employee to attain higher wages and long-term careers.
- Another proposal (WLCS0106) requires the W-2 Community Steering Committee to establish an advisory committee on transportation strategies and planning; requires W-2 agencies to provide an accounting of the amount expended on W-2 related transportation services each contract year; and raises the eligibility limit for W-2 transportation assistance to at or below 165% of the FPL.

These proposals and others made by the Special Committee can be viewed at <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/lc/index.html> under 1998 Study Committees.

Committee members expressed concern that a Technical College System Board representative was a member of the Special Committee and no one with W-2 specific knowledge was. Discussion followed that the State needs to support the Job Center system with funding. Many committee members agreed that issues should be raised with the Special Committee before the proposals are introduced as bills.

Issue/Discussion: Medicaid Update, Susan Wood, DHFS

Susan Wood presented an update on the status of BadgerCare. BadgerCare phase 1 – expanding eligibility to teens - was implemented April 1. As of the end of May, there are 2638 additional children covered under the program. Funds were added to support updated caseload estimates – the program is now budgeted for 67,535 individuals by the end of the biennium, for a total cost of \$161,226,000 all funds. Income Maintenance funding to support the increase in IM caseload associated with BadgerCare remains at \$4.5 million all funds – the funding source was changed from GPR earmarked as TANF Maintenance of Effort (MOE) to regular GPR and federal match. The DHFS request for authority to set the premiums at no more than 3.5% was not approved, so premiums will be no more than 3% of family income.

Judy Weseman asked why there is not an increase in IM funding when there will be an increase in the number of people served. Susan stated that the Medicaid caseload has decreased with no corresponding decrease in IM funding. Committee members ascertained that the IM funding was reduced in 1997. Jean Rogers clarified that there was a re-sort of where dollars went between IM and W-2 but there was not a reduction in funding.

Extensive changes in CARES to implement BadgerCare are scheduled to go into production July 16 – 17. User acceptance testing has been underway for 3-4 weeks conducted by a joint team of DWD, Deloitte Consulting and DHFS staff – test results have been excellent. Susan explained that the processing of individuals already in CARES would result in minimal work. Mary Ann Cook questioned if there has been information gathered from other places that have a premium. National studies show anytime there is a premium, some people chose not to participate because of it. Committee members discussed the fact that some of those already in CARES may chose not to; however, most of those individual are under 150% of FPL and would not have a premium.

In addition to all of the BadgerCare training for eligibility workers and other staff of IM and W-2 agencies, statewide training for community groups, public health departments and health care providers is underway, offered by Automated Health Systems, Inc. A new brochure, poster, and other promotional materials will be distributed around July 1, and a number of efforts are underway to coordinate outreach with other programs such as WIC and the school lunch programs. The Dept. of Public Instruction will be sending a mailing to school districts. A video of the television public service announcement will be distributed to all IM agencies and Public Health agencies. Per committee members' request, Susan will check on the availability of these videos for W-2 agencies as well. New BadgerCare materials are being added at www.dhfs.state.wi.us – fact sheets and brochures will be published by July 1.

Phyllis Birmingham referred to page 8 of the BadgerCare Administrator's Memo, which stated EDS would be answering questions. She attempted to do so and was told they were not answering questions regarding BadgerCare. Susan stated this was incorrect and if anyone had difficulty in getting information from EDS to please notify her.

Issue/Discussion: EBT Update, Dick Mellinger, DWD

The EBT coordinators' meeting has been moved to July 16, 1999. Dick Mellinger encouraged county IM agencies to send their coordinators. The meeting will be videotaped and sent to those agencies unable to attend. Liz Green of the Rock Co. Human Services Department heads the pilot workgroup and Bob Davis heads the Milwaukee workgroup.

County staff will manage and perform the tasks associated with the process of converting their clients to EBT. Each county will designate a coordinator to manage the conversion process. DES is responsible for coordinating and supporting the counties during the rollout of EBT. The county conversion model now being developed by DES with the assistance of the pilot workgroup envisions a continuous processing of clients through the conversion cycle. The process includes the site, reception, a video (available in English, Spanish, Hmong and Russian), card issuance, PIN selection and a point of sale (POS) transaction. Jean Rogers indicated that the POS transaction is designed to get clients comfortable with the practice of using EBT. Other states have had unsatisfactory experiences with simply mailing a pamphlet and EBT card to clients so hands on training is being provided to counter that.

Staff functions are equivalent to clerical duties. The staffing template indicates the number of staff required for conversion. Counties can request additional CAPS devices. Staff resources may include volunteers, CSJ participants, temporary agency help and clerical support from other departments. DES support will include training the county coordinator, workers and support staff; a conversion and ongoing site guide; and help desk assistance via the telephone.

Clients per County	CAPS Devices	Minimum Staff Required	Number of Counties	Range of Days needed
300 or less	1	2	37	1 to 5
300 to 600	2	3	24	3 to 5
600 to 2000	3	4-5	13	4 to 10
2000 or greater	4	6	4	9 to 14

Committee members expressed concern that clients may not show for their conversion appointment until they fail to get their food stamps. However, clients will receive two notices with their monthly food stamps, followed by one additional notice. It was suggested that agencies consider having workers call clients to remind them; also, agencies may want to consider having evening and Saturday office hours during the conversion.

Kelly Grant asked what would be done in areas without analog phone lines. The Department is working on this issue. The EBT conversion system is a stand-alone system not dependent on CARES availability. A question was also raised about homebound individuals. Meeting their needs will be part of the site preparation plan and may include some special directed efforts.

In regard to funding issues, the CAPS devices are part of the contract between the Department and Citibank. Counties will be responsible for supplying televisions and VCRs for the video portion of the process. Dick Buschmann asked about the issue of ongoing maintenance of staffing for the process. The primary method for card issuance and PIN selection will be through the mail after conversion.

Issue/Discussion: Y2K Administrator's Memo, Nancy Buckwalter, Data Systems Administrator

Nancy Buckwalter distributed a draft Administrator's Memo entitled YEAR 2000 CONTINGENCY PLANS. Contingency planning, also known as business continuity planning, focuses on reducing the risk of Y2K induced business failures. The memo describes the intent of the Department of Workforce Development (DWD), Division of Economic Support (DES) to work together with its partners in meeting obligations to ensure quality and consistent customer service. To that end, DES has developed contingency planning tools that identify DES responsibilities and local agency responsibilities for successfully achieving uninterrupted service to our customers.

Attached to the draft memo are the Child Support, Child Care, Food Stamp, General Business, Medicaid, and W-2 Local Agency Y2K Business Plan Checklists. The checklists contain information regarding when a local agency should take action, the substitute business activities that must occur if automation is not available, the solutions as described by the state, and an assurance that local agencies will perform required functions or propose alternative solutions. Completed Y2K Contingency Business Plan Checklists and signed Assurance statement must be submitted to the Area Administrators no later than 4:30 p.m. August 16, 1999.

Committee members were asked to supply comments on the draft to Nancy Buckwalter by e-mail at buckwna@dwd.state.wi.us or by phone at (608) 266-7160 by July 2, 1999.

Jan Van Vleck questioned the difference between this plan and what is required in the RFP. Michael Van Dyke asked why 15 copies of the RFP are due by July 8 and then another copy of the contingency plan is due August 16. This contingency plan is required for current contract holders and the RFP is for potential contractors. The current contract process is separate from the RFP review process so separate copies are necessary. Judy Weseman commented that DWE is asking for different information in the plans they are requesting. Committee members agreed they would like DES and DWE to coordinate their contingency plan requests. Nancy will take this request to the Y2K office; however, each division is doing an assessment of their responsibilities so different information may be necessary. Mary Ann Cook stated she appreciated the new information given in the draft Administrator's Memo.

Nancy discussed the audits the Department is undergoing and the federal review scheduled for the first two weeks of July. There has been a 46% response to the information requests sent to partners by the Department and of these only 10% of the submitted information was complete. Because of this, a letter has been drafted to be sent to County Executives, County Board Chairs, Child Support Directors, IM Agency Directors and W-2 Agency Directors indicating if the requested information is not provided in a timely manner, there may be monetary sanctions.

Dick Buschmann requested that agency directors be given the opportunity to supply the information before this letter is sent to the public officials. Jean Rogers indicated that she would be willing to carry that message to the Secretary's office. However, the agencies may want the letter to go out quickly in order to encourage the IT and contingency planning parts of their organizations to become Y2K ready. Shirley Ross concurred, stating they could use this letter as a tool to ensure compliance. Michael Van Dyke ~~commented that some County Corporate Counsels have advised that the county not make an absolute statement regarding Y2K compliance. raised the issue of County Corporate Counsel stating not to assure absolute compliance.~~ Department legal counsel drafted the letter to be sent to the agencies so if there are legal issues, the County Corporate Counsel should speak to Howard Bernstein.

Issue/Discussion: Customer Satisfaction Survey, Kevin Huggins, DES Regional Office

The W-2 RFP includes a response item regarding customer satisfaction in Section 7.1.7 f. The Department is asking the committee to provide recommendations by August 31, 1999, which will be used internally to develop a survey tool by September 30, 1999.

Mary Ann Cook questioned what the expectations were for committee participation in this process. The purpose of the discussion was to determine what kind of input the committee wants to provide. Jean Rogers stated that the agencies have asked for a guide covering programmatic areas, financial areas and customer service areas so that they are all operating from the same page. The Department is looking for a way to ask the most useful questions.

Mary Ann indicated that a customer satisfaction process exists in the Dane Co. Job Center already consisting of surveys completed one week every quarter. She stated she was leery of statewide standards and would like to keep open the possibility of different approaches at a local level. Some committee members felt the tool developed should be tweaked to fit in the Job Center environment to serve all partners; however, this tool is for the W-2 agency. This survey would be a point in time snapshot tool completed twice a year at the same time in all areas. Information would be shared with both the local agency and the Department.

Committee members expressed concern that typical satisfaction surveys never focus on the customer's expectations. Satisfaction with services received can vary depending what the customer was expecting. Questions were raised over what level of specificity is expected. Committee members agreed that this survey should stick to general issues of satisfaction. To assist with this process, committee members agreed to send existing customer satisfaction tools to Kevin Huggins at 200 N. Jefferson, Green Bay, WI 54301 by June 25, 1999.

MAXIMUS, Dane Co., Fond du Lac Co., Southwest Consortium, Milwaukee Co., Sauk/Columbia Co., Oneida Tribe and Kenosha Co. volunteered to name a representative to the subcommittee. Kevin Huggins will be leading this subcommittee effort and will contact committee members from these agencies to obtain this information. Phyllis Birmingham stated DWE is sponsoring a workshop on June 25 entitled "Designing Customer Satisfaction Surveys". It was suggested that the facilitators of this training be part of the subcommittee.

Jude Morse reminded committee members that this process is separate from the RFP process. Kevin indicated there will be an addendum to the RFP regarding the customer satisfaction language. Committee members questioned how this addendum will read but this was not known at the time.

Issue/Discussion: Contingency Fund, Alice Wilkins, DES/BWI

The W-2 Contract and Implementation Committee has as one of its functions a role in developing recommendations for criteria for accessing the Contingency Fund by July 30, 1999. The Department will consider the recommendations of the committee and issue the criteria. Alice Wilkins and the workgroup (Mary Ann Cook, Rosa Dominguez, Mona Garland, Deb Hughes, Ed Kamin and Tina Koehn) had an initial meeting on June 11 with discussion centering on benefits and office expenses.

The workgroup made the following initial recommendations for discussion by the committee as a whole:

ACCESSING CONTINGENCY FUND FOR BENEFITS:

- Assuring benefits for individuals determined eligible must be top priority.
- Benefits for caseload in excess of RFP projections should be funded.
- Some difference between small and large agencies in terms of timelines and resulting risk (i.e., For small agencies, one additional case may mean significant increase and therefore significant financial risk.)
 - Recommend 5 or fewer cases = "small agency"
 - For small agencies, one additional case triggers immediate access to CF
 - For larger agencies, monitor on a regular basis (quarterly); projected increases in excess of RFP caseload assumptions are the basis for requesting access to CF
- Contingency Funds cannot be added to contract until agency has paid out all benefit dollars (without transfer to Office).

ACCESSING CONTINGENCY FUNDS FOR SERVICES/ADMINISTRATION:

- Proportionate increase is needed in Services/Admin. based on increase in caseload.
 - Increased caseload is defined as any increase in the factors used to project the Services/Admin. budget amounts in the RFP (except diversions): W-2 cash benefit cases, W-2 non-cash cases, FSET cases, child care cases, and non-custodial parent cases.
 - Recommend 3% increase as threshold.
- Contingency fund should also be available to cover newly mandated services and services that change from "allowable" to "mandated."

Under general discussion points, the workgroup listed the contingency fund is "risk protection," needed for agencies in light of elimination of profit under contract. Jean Rogers clarified that the contingency fund is risk protection only. Mary Ann Cook stated that under the current contract, profit was available to meet additional needs. Agencies assumed the funding was sufficient to cover the caseload and result in potential profit. Under the next contract, the W-2 allocation is less than the current caseloads so agencies are assuming more risk. Jean reminded agencies that the level of expenditures could be adjusted by reducing the caseload and by adjusting spending. Mary Ann indicated there is not enough money in the allocations to fund an unexpected caseload increase. Jean stated that agencies have the ability to spend across benefits and office. She questioned where underspending of the contract for a time followed by a caseload increase over the projection is addressed. The reconciliation process would accommodate this scenario.

Michael Van Dyke clarified that any draw on the contingency fund would be repaid before bonus is paid out under the current contract. Committee members agreed this should be included as a recommendation from the group for the RFP language.

Jean Rogers stated that the contingency fund discussion should not be centered on the assumption there isn't enough money allocated for the contract. If that were the case, agencies would not pursue the contract. Phyllis Birmingham stated that the agencies they represent have worked very hard and have a commitment to the residents in their areas so they want to continue to manage the programs. Jude Morse indicated that under the RFP structure, there is no ownership of unspent amounts. Unspent funds disappear from the agency's contract. An agency may determine rather than retaining use of contingency funds to return them and utilize the fluidity of the contract.

Jean recommended that Bob Nikolay meet with this workgroup. Other recommendations for the workgroup should be forwarded to Alice Wilkins or any of the other workgroup members. The next meeting is scheduled for July 12 from 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. in Room 171 at GEF 1. Final recommendations of the workgroup will be presented to the Committee at the July 16 meeting.

Issue/Discussion: 24-Month Time Limits Update, Margaret McMahon, DES/BWI

Margaret McMahon informed the committee that she had accepted a position as an Assistant Area Administrator for the Madison region. She will be retaining some of her role with time limits from a regional office perspective; however, Jane Jilk will be assuming the time limits policy area.

Margaret addressed the concerns of the committee raised at the May meeting. Committee members had questioned whether there would be consideration of extending the time frame of an extension. Margaret indicated the Department is

looking at other options and working with legal counsel. One option would be to increase the length of the extension to 6 months. An Operations Memo to be issued within the next week will indicate whether this has been approved.

Questions were raised over the number of cases approaching their time limits and how the Departmental review process will be able to handle the numbers. Early intervention has been successful in reducing the number of cases using months of eligibility. For example, in March 1999 507 cases were scheduled to reach their 24th month as of October 1999. As of April 1999, this number was reduced to 413 cases. Early indications show that cases scheduled to reach their 24th month as of October 1999 have now dropped to 358 cases and cases scheduled to reach their 24th month by November 1999 have dropped to 56. The Department's goal is to continue to reduce these numbers in order to a) ensure participants are moving into unsubsidized employment or to a higher rung of the W-2 ladder; and b) preserve the internal review process designed to look at these harder to serve cases on a case-by-case basis.

A question had been asked regarding whom would represent the Department's denial of an extension request. Margaret confirmed that the Department would represent the decision if it denies the request. This information will also be in the forthcoming Operations Memo. Committee members questioned whether a client who won an appeal would receive retroactive payments. No retroactive payments are possible for a period of time where there was no participation in W-2 activities. Deb Hughes asked about payments received by a client beyond the 24 months before an extension was approved. The agency should close the case at 24 months and no payment should be issued. CARES will not automatically do this so CARES instructions are needed for this process. Agencies may want to consider requiring supervisory sign off on any payments issued beyond the 24-month time frame.

Another concern was the denial of an extension request because the agency failed to do its job. Extensions will be approved or denied based on the extension criteria. These are reiterated in the upcoming Operations Memo and include instructions for the FEP. The W2-T criteria have been expanded to include the following: A W-2 T participant may qualify for an extension if the participant has made all appropriate efforts to find unsubsidized employment by participating in all assigned activities and significant barriers prevent advancement to a higher W-2 employment position.

Regarding the question of whether or not the process would be redesigned, Margaret stated the process would be reviewed after a six-month period. As stated last month, legislative action would be required to change the 24-month time limit from applying to certain cases. The committee had also asked for more information about the internal review process. This will be discussed in the Operations Memo.

Committee members had cited examples of cases they believed to be beyond the control of the FEP, such as mental health issues. FEPs are not expected to be experts in providing services; however, they are expected to be community resource experts. Their role is not to solve problems but to steer their clients toward available resources. Case Management Strategies, an enhanced case management course, offers practical approaches to working with custodial and noncustodial parents.

The last issue to address was failure to serve. This issue will also be addressed in the Operations Memo. There are many sources used to identify an agency's failure to serve. If the review team thought the case record indicated a failure to serve, they would initiate that process. Diane Hausinger stated that agencies needed to be proactive and have a process in place to address cases approaching the end of their time limit to avoid this possibility.

Margaret explained there would be two Operations Memos issued regarding time limits. One focuses on case management and the strategies FEPs can use to work with cases approaching their time limits, including those who will not be getting an extension. The other addresses extensions and the requirement that a FEP must discuss extensions with participants no later than their 18th month. CARES notices will be generated 1) when a participant qualifies for an extension and the agency will request one; 2) when a participant does not qualify for an extension and the agency will not request one, including the reasons why; and 3) when the participant may qualify for an extension but declines one.

Mary Ann Cook questioned how this affects cases where the participant is failing to participate, the case is open and the clock is ticking. Margaret suggested agencies could schedule the individual for a review appointment and close for lack of review if they fail to attend. Jim Krivsky asked about those who decline an extension and then change their mind or show up after their 24 months have expired.

Issue/Discussion: Monthly CARES Update Report, Tim Hinline, DES/BWI

See attached report. Tim Hinline indicated the 20 and 23 months job clock notices have been implemented. Logic will be added for job clock extensions in July, while auto failure of extensions will be added in August. Automatic failure for expired clocks will be implemented in September. Manual failure reasons are available. Tim also distributed CARES transaction counts for April and May.

In reference to the automation of Community Reinvestment continuing to be on hold, Deb Hughes asked when the meeting would be held with Research & Statistics. Tim replied they are waiting for R & S to schedule the meeting.

Issue/Discussion: Other Issues, Jean Rogers

An email from Mary Ann Cook asked that the following questions be addressed at the June meeting under Other Issues. *How are Children First participants who are required to participate expected to be served when they move to another county? Is there any procedure for the money following the participant?* The Bureau of Child Support administers the Children First program; currently there are 44 counties and 1 tribe voluntarily participating in the program. Since some counties do not have CF programs and it would be difficult to transfer the money, the money does not follow the participant.

Update on OPs Memo 99-33 (FS for Refugee Vets). Additional information was received in one region that requires hearing process for persons who were not named in suit. Please explain rationale. Discussion of ways to communicate with refugee population growing increasingly distrustful of agency action because of inconsistencies. Operations Memo 99-33 provided direction to counties regarding the restoration of food stamps to certain veteran Hmong and Highland Laotian legal aliens and their families. On May 27, 1999, the Department received a letter from the USDA expressing concern over restoring these benefits with federal funds. In response to this, Sue Levy issued a letter to the regions on June 11 indicating agencies should stop any benefits that were restored by OPs Memo 99-33. The Department has drafted a letter to the Federal government indicating Wisconsin will comply with the directive but are seeking ways to provide services to these veterans and their families. A DXBM also addressed this. Committee members requested a formal Operations Memo to rescind the directive in OPs Memo 99-33. The Department is reviewing this possibility with legal counsel.

Update on youth services money included in Governor's Budget for PICs and W-2 agencies. When and how will these funds, if approved, be made available? What will criteria be for distribution? A copy of the Joint Committee on Finance paper was distributed which detailed their recommendations for the Community Youth Grants: to provide \$7.5 million annually for the program; to provide \$3,150,000 in 1999-00 and \$3,650,000 in 2000-01 to the Boys & Girls Clubs of America, the Silver Spring Neighborhood Association, the Safe and Sound Initiative, the Good Samaritan Project, the Youth Leadership Academy and the Milwaukee passports for Youth Program.

Issue/Discussion: Future Meeting Schedule, Jean Rogers

During the first year of its appointment, the committee agreed to meet monthly and has continued in that fashion to date. A proposed meeting schedule for the remainder of the year was distributed for comment.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Location</i>
Friday, July 16, 1999	10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.	101 S. Webster Street GEF 2, Room 27 Madison, WI 53707
Friday, August 20, 1999	10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.	101 S. Webster Street GEF 2, Room 27 Madison, WI 53707
Friday, September 17, 1999	10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.	101 S. Webster Street GEF 2, Room 27 Madison, WI 53707
Friday, October 15, 1999	10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.	101 S. Webster Street GEF 2, Room 27 Madison, WI 53707
Friday, November 19, 1999	10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.	101 S. Webster Street GEF 2, Room 27 Madison, WI 53707
Friday, December 17, 1999	10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.	101 S. Webster Street GEF 2, Room 27 Madison, WI 53707

Committee members indicated that at one time it was agreed that the location would rotate. However, Madison is a central location and state staff are available to present information if the meeting is held in Madison. It was recommended that a different meeting room be located in Madison.

RECENT AND UPCOMING CARES CHANGES OVERVIEW

Issued June 18,1999

Major Initiatives: Completed or in Progress	DATE	BACKGROUND
Clocks	7/9 – 9/99	The 20 and 23 months job clock notices have been implemented. Logic will be added for job clock extensions in July, while auto failure of extensions will be added in August. Automatic failure for expired clocks will be implemented in September. Manual failure reasons are available at this time.
BadgerCare	7/19/99	Although BadgerCare will be effective on 7/1/99, it will be implemented in CARES beginning 7/19. State staff testing began on 5/24 and is proceeding quite smoothly. Train-the-trainers have been completed. Worker training will be in June.
FPL Mass Change	9/10	The annual mass change for Food Stamps is scheduled on the weekend of Sep 10 th .
Food Stamp EBT	10/1/99	There has been a change in direction in that MA benefits and FS benefits will not share the same swipe card at this time. However, the implementation schedule remains the same. The Rock County pilot is scheduled to begin operation in 10/99 with full roll out beginning after January 2000.
Pro-Rated/Wage Paying CSJs	10/04/99	The automation of the pro-rated and wage paying CSJs will be put into CARES in October 1999.
Major Fatafs	Ongoing	Research continues on fatafs, which occur when there are a large number of unconfirmed rows on AGECS. Also, work is continuing to reduce the overall number of fatafs and abends. The overall number of fatafs and abends which are occurring has decreased to under 100 per week. The average daily transaction count is over a million transactions per day.
Client Registration – Clearance	No date set	We are researching the various causes of duplicate PINs and exploring solutions to reduce their occurrence. We are also researching the best method of resolving duplicate PINs when they do occur.
Y2K	Ongoing	Planning has begun for the Fall round of Y2K testing. Also, a review of contingency plans for all programs will be conducted during the last two weeks of June. A walkthrough of the contingency plans, involving several counties will be conducted in late summer.
Community Reinvestment	On-Hold	DES conducted a preliminary review of options. A meeting will be held with R&S to determine federal reporting requirements. Once an option and reporting requirements are determined, Deloitte Consulting will be asked for an estimate to implement in CARES.
Major initiatives: In Planning/Development		
SSA State On-Line Query (SOLQ)	5/99	The necessary query screen and audit trail has been programmed in CARES. Dane County will be the pilot county. SSA is not allowing private employee access at this time. Analysis to determine security requirements in CARES to limit access to state and county staff is continuing.
Simulation for Benefit Recovery		Programs that had different versions in production and simulation have been identified and plans have been made to correct this situation. Procedures have been put in place to avoid this situation in the future. A survey is being prepared for completion by county staff to determine the cause and extent of benefit recovery problems. Site visits are being planned to observe the processes and problems encountered when doing benefit recovery.